

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/896,548	06/29/2001	Adrianus Josephes van den Nieuwelaar	V0028/260425	4345
23370	7590 05/28/2004		EXAMINER	
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ			FRANK, ELLIOT L	
	STOCKTON, LLP		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 2800	INDE STREET		2125 DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004	
ATLANTA, (GA 30309			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Nh P	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/896,548	VAN DEN NIEUWE	LAAR ET AL.				
7.447.66. y 7.164.67.	Examiner	Art Unit					
·	Elliot L Frank	2125					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 22 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in all rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a tion in				
PERIOD FOR RE	<u>:PLY</u> [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amothe shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 22 April 2004. Appe 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of		in				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be							
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment				
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ requesthe application in condition for allowance be 6.□ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because.	ecause: See Continuation Sheet.						
raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo 			ind an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	avad og b\\\ diagnoravad by th	F					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	•						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·					
0. Other:	LEO PIO SUPERVISORY PAT TECHNOLOGY O	ENT EXAMINER					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The examiner has read and considered the applicant's after-final submission. This document follows a request for reconsideration presented after the first action on the merits, to which the examiner replied with a final action.

The argument in this reconsideration attempts to both reinforce the previously presented argument and to refute the examiner's response to the previous applicant submission.

The examiner maintains that the rejection is proper in view of the broadest, most reasonable interpretation of the claims .

BEST AVAILABLE COPY